	Case #:	12	Examine	r's Name:	Bataille			
4.9.	ıl Number:	09/591,615	Calladia per mula ses mienes e menello	Prograr Part:	Full			
	Home SPE:	Kim /		Art Unit:	2186			
	SORGESEL.	Children Control		1000-74-200				
		Evaluation Sumn	nary: Clear Erro	or(s)				
Indic	ated PEF C	lear Errors:	A Day of the State	ACAN SECTION OF THE S	2012	21. 1.0833455. (1.3		
☐ 1a compliance with formal requirements								
□ 1	b technolo	ogical accuracy	-					
✓ 2	treating	disclosure state	ements and clai	ms of priority				
□ 3	planning	planning field of search						
✓ 4	conduct	conducting search						
☑ 5	analyzin	analyzing disclosure and claims for compliance with 35 USC 112						
✓ 6		formulating rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 with supporting rationale, or determining how claim(s) distinguish over the prior art						
☑ 7	determi	ning whether an	nendment intro	duces new ma	tter			
□ 8	determi	determining whether restriction is proper						
□ 9	determi	determining whether claimed invention is operable/useful as disclosed						
	0 evaluati	evaluating/applying case law as necessary						
□ 1	1 evaluati	ng sufficiency of	f affidavits/dec	larations				
□ 1		determing whether appropriate line of patentable distinction is maintained between application and/or patents						
□ 1:	3 evaluati	ng sufficiency of	f reissue oath/o	leclaration				
□ 1	4 evaluati	ng appropriaten	ess of ground o	f reexamination	on			
PEF Details:								
Improp	per treatment	of priority claim no	certified copy four	nd in the file.		· ·		
Claims	s 3, 4, 5, "first	requestor" and "sec	ond requestor" lac	k antecedent bas	is. They are circuits.			
Claim	12 does not n	nake sense. There i	is no previously rec	ited step of select	ting results.			
		ejection, the 103 sta the rejection which		Pawate et al. in vie	ew of Boutaud et al. based	upon		
to mod	dify the primar ses". A mino	y reference. Since t	the 102 standard is	of inherency, it is	rejection for the references more correct to say the re has not made a proper 102	ference		
		wrapper that the exercise on page 1 of		o review the relate	ed applications which are			
		or the examiner doe pecific than (or ever			s rejection. Both argument	ts		
		ÚS patents are cite ee FP 6.49.06).	d, but the examiner	has not informed	I the applicant that they ha	ve not		
The in	The incorporation by reference on page 11 is improper. Both US patents discussed there contain							

discusse portion 4 and seco into subp	appears to introduce new matter. The sum of the first polition and the second portion. The species the first and second portions being of different sizes. Then on page 7, line 24+, the shared memory 2b has a size S3 that is equal to S1 minus S2, but that is not the same as saying the sum of the first and portions equals the total size. The total size of the memory is usually a preset value that is carved portions. Making the portions additive theoretically could result in overruns in that allocation (I.e., not memory for the applications/circuits being used).				
Indicated AT Clear Errors:					
∨ a	includes all reasonable rejections and/or objections, (MPEP 707.07(g)				
□ b	makes no unreasonable rejection				
□ c	makes no unreasonable formal requirement				
□ d	takes no arbitrary or capricious action				
_ e	makes the record, taken as a whole, reasonably clear and complete				
☑ f	properly treats all matters of substance in applicant's response				
AT Details:					
Claims 3	, 4, 5, "first requestor" and "second requestor" lack antecedent basis. They are circuits.				
Claim 12 does not make sense. There is no previously recited step of selecting results.					
Claim 11 appears to introduce new matter: "the sum of the first portion and the second portion." The spec discusses the first and second portions being of different sizes. Then on page 7, line 24+, the shared memory portion 42b has a size S3 that is equal to S1 minus S2, but that is not the same as saying the sum of the first and second portions equals the total size. The total size of the memory is usually a preset value that is carved into subportions. Making the portions additive theoretically could result in overruns in that allocation (l.e., not enough memory for the applications/circuits being used).					
The response to applicant's arguments regarding Claim 8 is unclear. The examiner does not appear to adequately address the argument the "control registers are not shared" and the claim recites the sharing occurs in the first mode of operation.					
The incorporation by reference on page 11 is improper. Both US patents discussed there contain incorporations to other applications in their respective specifications which prevents the applicant from making them the basis for an incorporation by reference. The public should not have to do unlimited construction of references in order to determine how to make or use the applicant's device.					
Indicated Allowability Clear Errors:					
а	determines that all claims are patentable (under 35 USC 102 and 103), over the art of record				
□ p	determines that all claims are patentable (under 35 USC 102 and 103), over all art which is not of record but should have been				
□ c	determines that all claims are patentable over all other pertinent sections of the statue (e.g., 101, 112, 251, etc.)				
□ d	determines that all claims are patentable over all non-statutory rejections (e.g., obviousness type double patenting)				
Allowat	pility Details:				
NONE					

incorporations to other applications in their respective specifications which prevents the applicant from making them the basis for an incorporation by reference. The public should not have to do unlimited construction of references in order to determine how to make or use the applicant's device.

Monday, September 15, 2003 10:29:21 AM